Research Manual

A Guide to Effective Policy Advocacy

©:Zac Kienzle[†]

[†] University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

Contents

1 Preliminary Setup

Operational efficacy within the Protocol Policy Lab is predicated on the standardisation of administrative workflows to mitigate coordination friction and preserve institutional memory. Adherence to structured protocols is essential for maintaining the integrity of the research lifecycle, ensuring that administrative outputs are as reproducible and transparent as the research itself (Sandve et al., 2013; Peng, 2011). To facilitate this consistency, the Lab mandates the use of the Master Calendar for temporal coordination and the Meeting Minutes Template for the accurate preservation of internal discourse. Furthermore, all new initiatives must be structured via the Project Proposal Template. At the same time, the communication of outcomes requires the Director's Summary for Prospectus Template, ensuring that all outputs remain consistent with established practices in scientific administration (Wilson et al., 2017).

2 Resources and Toolings

Effective policy research necessitates a transition from *ad hoc* searching to systematic discovery. Researchers should adopt the PRISMA Statement (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) to ensure transparency and replicability in literature synthesis. The parameters for high-impact evidence gathering are defined by established protocols for professional literature reviews (Watson, 2020). Robust literature searching requires a structured, step-by-step approach to identify, select, and synthesise sources (Chigbu et al., 2023), ensuring that review articles maintain a specific purpose and structure (Palmatier, Houston, and Hulland, 2018).

Table 1: Common Literature Search Terminology (Watson, 2020; De Brún and Pearce-Smith, 2014)

Term	Meaning
Boolean operators	Words (AND, OR and NOT) that can be used to combine search terms in order to widen or limit the search result.
Database	An online collection of citations to journal articles, which have been indexed to make retrieval easier. Some databases also provide full-text access to the articles.
Limits	Options within a database that allow search results to be broken down further. Common limits include year(s) of publication, document type, and language.
Search strategy	The list of search terms and limits used to retrieve relevant articles from a database in order to answer a search question.
Subject headings	Terms assigned to describe a concept that may have many alternative keywords. These keywords are brought together under this single term. Most health-related databases use subject headings.

Primary discovery prioritises repositories of grey literature and legislative movements over general search engines to ensure that analysis remains current and non-derivative. The Analysis & Policy Observatory (APO) serves as the essential repository for Australian policy. Policy Commons provides access to global think-tank outputs and preserves evidence that frequently vanishes from official governmental domains. For real-time tracking of legislative intent, researchers consult the Hansard Archive to analyse second reading speeches and committee transcripts.

Statistical authority and legal currency provide the empirical foundations for policy advocacy. AustLII and LawCite serve to verify the status of statutory interpretations and judicial precedents. For standardised socio-economic benchmarking, the OECD iLibrary and World Bank Open Data provide high levels of cross-jurisdictional reliability. Recommendations for social intervention require cross-referencing with The Campbell Collaboration to ensure that proposed policies are grounded in causal efficacy and proven social outcomes.

Rigorous methodological design and reporting integrity depend on adherence to international frameworks. The EQUATOR Network provides specific reporting guidelines, such as the STROBE statement, for observational studies. Hands-on toolkits for finding evidence provide the technical skills required for comprehensive evidence synthesis. All policy analysis follows structured frameworks for effective problem solving with a specific focus on the *Assemble Evidence* and *Select Criteria* phases (De Brún and Pearce-Smith, 2014; Bardach and Patashnik, 2024).

To maintain bibliometric stability, all research artifacts are version-controlled in the Protocol Policy Lab Repository and typeset via Overleaf.

2.1 Github Repositories and CLI Tools

The Protocol Policy Lab employs distributed Version Control Systems (VCS) to establish a rigorous epistemic infrastructure for policy advocacy. Unlike traditional file management, which is susceptible to versioning ambiguity and data loss, a Git-based workflow enforces the creation of an immutable audit trail for all research artifacts (Ram, 2013). This approach situates the Lab's output within a high-integrity reproducibility spectrum, transforming static policy claims into verifiable derivatives of a transparent analytical process (Peng, 2011).

Data manipulation scripts and analytical code are treated as primary research outputs rather than ephemeral tooling; consequently, all custom scripts must be version-controlled to ensure the precise retrieval of the logic underpinning specific policy recommendations (Sandve et al., 2013). To mitigate the risks associated with manual graphical user interface (GUI) interactions, Command Line Interface (CLI) tools are utilised to script and automate

analysis pipelines, ensuring that data processing remains consistent, transparent, and independent of human error (Wilson et al., 2017).

2.2 Overleaf

The Lab utilises Overleaf to maintain high standards of typesetting consistency and bibliometric precision across all deliverables. While WYSIWYG editors provide expediency for simple text generation, LaTeX demonstrates superior stability for managing complex document structures and mathematical notation (Knauff and Nejasmic, 2014). The utility of this environment lies in the strict decoupling of content from formatting; this forces researchers to focus on argumentative rigour while the underlying class files automatically enforce the stylistic templates mandated by government standards (Knauff and Nejasmic, 2014).

3 Research Workflows

Effective policy research within the Lab operates through a structured lifecycle designed to bridge the gap between academic inquiry and political decision-making (Brownson et al., 2006). To ensure relevance, working groups must engage in active agenda setting rather than passive observation. This involves identifying "policy windows", transient opportunities where problem streams, political events, and policy solutions converge (Weible, 2023). Researchers are expected to monitor the legislative calendar via the repositories identified in the previous section, specifically targeting Bills entering the Second Reading stage or Committee review, where nonpartisan analysis can most effectively influence the legislative outcome (Hird, 2005; Birkland, 2020).

Once a topic is secured, the investigative phase employs the "Eightfold Path" to rigorously define the problem and select evaluation criteria before data collection begins (Bardach and Patashnik, 2024). The literature search must be executed systematically; researchers apply the Boolean logic and database limits detailed in Table 1 to construct reproducible search strings (Watson, 2020). This adherence to the PRISMA reporting guidelines ensures that evidence synthesis is comprehensive and free from selection bias, distinguishing rigorous policy analysis from partisan advocacy (Page et al., 2021).

For projects addressing statutory reform, the workflow necessitates a specific focus on legal interpretation. Researchers must utilise *LawCite* and *AustLII* to trace the legislative history and judicial application of relevant Acts. This ensures that recommendations are grounded in a correct understanding of statutory purpose and the "mischief" the law intends to remedy (Barnes, Dharmananda, and Moran, 2023). Finally, the Lab leverages the specific dynamics of team composition to maximise impact. While large teams are often associated with developing existing ideas, we deploy smaller, agile research units to produce the disruptive, high-impact concepts necessary to challenge prevailing policy paradigms (Wu, Wang, and Evans, 2019).

4 Advocacy Workflows

Policy advocacy necessitates a transition from passive dissemination to active *Knowledge Translation (KT)*. This process extends beyond transmission to the cultivation of communities of practice, bridging the epistemic gap between evidence production and policy implementation (Roland, 2018). Tacit knowledge must be systematically converted into explicit, codified artifacts to facilitate uptake and mitigate the temporal dissonance between researchers and policymakers (Wagner and Moos, 2015; Brownson et al., 2006).

Digital advocacy workflows must account for opaque algorithmic mediation. Academic social media exhibits a structural bias known as the Matthew Effect, where algorithms systematically prioritise content from established actors (Monteiro-Krebs et al., 2021). Counter-strategies must leverage the disruptive potential of small research units to introduce novel concepts (Wu, Wang, and Evans, 2019).

Implementation requires a rejection of the deficit model in favour of narrative-driven and visual communication (Portman, Miara Ms, and Baram-Tsabari, 2025). Visual abstracts encapsulate methodology and recommendations, outperforming text-heavy formats in retention (Portman, Miara Ms, and Baram-Tsabari, 2025). Audience segmentation is critical; distinct demographics respond to divergent stimuli, necessitating platform-specific tailoring (Zickar, 2020). Credibility is maintained through explicit signalling of institutional affiliation and credentials (Portman, Miara Ms, and Baram-Tsabari, 2025). Evaluation prioritises engagement depth and bibliometric impact over passive vanity metrics (Monteiro-Krebs et al., 2021; Klar et al., 2020).

5 Stylistic Conventions

Deliverables must strictly adhere to the Australian Government Style Manual to ensure institutional legitimacy and accessibility. The fundamental rhetorical framework is the inverted pyramid, which necessitates the positioning of conclusions and primary recommendations at the document's outset to accommodate the scanning behaviour of policy stakeholders.

Syntactic structures must favour the active voice to eliminate ambiguity regarding agency, while sentence length should be constrained to a maximum of 25 words to mitigate cognitive load and maximise retention. Paragraphs are restricted to a single thematic focus, initiated by a topic sentence that explicitly states the central argument or a transition sentence that establishes logical continuity with preceding text.

Orthographic conventions strictly adhere to Australian English, utilising the *Macquarie Dictionary* or the *Australian Concise Oxford Dictionary* as the arbiters of spelling. Capitalisation follows a minimalist protocol: headings and subheadings employ sentence case, and initial capitals are reserved exclusively for proper nouns and specific entities such as "Australian Government" or "Cabinet". At the same time, generic references to departments or ministerial positions are still lowercase.

Punctuation serves a functional rather than decorative role; the spaced en dash (––) replaces the em dash for parenthetical isolation or abrupt tonal shifts, whereas unspaced en dashes are restricted to numerical spans in tables or titles. The serial comma is omitted unless required to resolve immediate syntactic ambiguity within complex lists (Stone and Ford, 2017).

Typographical hierarchy is maintained through the use of sans-serif typefaces such as Arial or Helvetica to ensure digital legibility. Italics are reserved exclusively for the titles of Acts of Parliament, legal cases, complete published works, and scientific nomenclature, while foreign loanwords absorbed into standard English require no typographic variation. Possessive apostrophes are omitted from descriptive noun phrases, such as "drivers licence" or "workers compensation", as these denote category rather than ownership. Acronyms

and initialisms must be devoid of full stops and explicitly defined upon first occurrence, unless the shortened form is more widely recognised than the full term.

Numerical expressions follow a strict binary protocol to enhance readability. Integers from 2 upwards are rendered as numerals, while zero and one are written as words to prevent visual confusion with the letters "O" and "I", respectively. Commas are mandatory for numbers with four or more digits. Date formats must utilise the sequence Day Month Year without internal commas, employing non-breaking spaces to preserve line integrity. Temporal expressions use the 12-hour clock with a colon separator and a non-breaking space before the meridian indicator, except in technical contexts where the 24-hour clock is permissible for precision. Large rounded numbers (millions and above) combine numerals with words (e.g., "2.5 million") to facilitate rapid cognitive processing.

Bibliographic citations follow the Author-Date system to maintain flow within non-legal text. In-text citations must appear in parentheses, while the reference list requires full bibliographic details ordered alphabetically. To enhance digital utility, titles of online resources in the reference list must be hyperlinked, avoiding the display of raw URLs unless the document is intended for print. Legal citations require a distinct protocol, where the titles of Acts and cases are italicised in the body text but rendered in roman type within reference lists to enhance readability.

Tables and figures must be self-explanatory, featuring captions that include the unit of measurement and data source, ensuring that information is not solely conveyed through colour differentiation.

6 Integrity and Ethics Pledge

Fair use of generative AI, machine translation, how to cite/attribute, how to use it effectively, plagiarism, integrity pledge and so on.

References

Bardach, Eugene and Eric M. Patashnik (2024). *A practical guide for policy analysis: the eightfold path to more effective problem solving*. Seventh edition. London, United Kingdom: Sage. 205 pp. ISBN: 978-1-0718-8413-3.

Barnes, Jeffrey, Jacinta Dharmananda, and Eamonn Moran (2023). *Modern statutory interpretation: framework, principles and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1 p. ISBN: 978-1-108-81602-1 978-1-108-89563-7. DOI: 10.1017/9781108895637.

Birkland, Thomas A. (2020). *An introduction to the policy process: theories, concepts, and models of public policy making*. Fifth edition. New York, NY London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group. 1 p. ISBN: 978-1-138-49561-6 978-1-351-02394-8. DOI: 10.4324/9781351023948.

Brownson, Ross C. et al. (Feb. 1, 2006). "Researchers and Policymakers: Travelers in Parallel Universes". In: *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 30.2, pp. 164–172. ISSN: 0749-3797. DOI: 10.1016/j.amepre.2005.10.004. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S074937970500396X (visited on 01/02/2026).

Chigbu, Uchendu Eugene et al. (Jan. 6, 2023). "The Science of Literature Reviews: Searching, Identifying, Selecting, and Synthesising". In: *Publications* 11.1. Company: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute Distributor: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute Institution: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute Label: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute Publisher: publisher. ISSN: 2304-6775. DOI: 10.3390/publications11010002. URL: https://www.mdpi.com/2304-6775/11/1/2 (visited on 12/30/2025).

De Brún, Caroline and Nicola Pearce-Smith (2014). *Searching skills toolkit: finding the evidence*. 2nd edition. EBM toolkit series. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, BMJ/Books. ISBN: 978-1-118-46309-3.

Hird, John A. (Feb. 2005). "Policy Analysis for What? The Effectiveness of Nonpartisan Policy Research Organizations". In: *Policy Studies Journal* 33.1. Num Pages: 23 Place: Washington, United Kingdom Publisher: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., pp. 83–105. ISSN:

0190292X. DOI: 10.1111/j.1541-0072.2005.00093.x. URL: https://www.proquest.com/docview/210554882/abstract/534F48A48FE4AA7PQ/1 (visited on 12/29/2025).

Klar, Samara et al. (Apr. 6, 2020). "Using social media to promote academic research: Identifying the benefits of twitter for sharing academic work". In: *PLOS ONE* 15.4. Publisher: Public Library of Science, e0229446. ISSN: 1932-6203. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0229446. URL: https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0229446 (visited on 01/02/2026).

Knauff, Markus and Jelica Nejasmic (Dec. 19, 2014). "An Efficiency Comparison of Document Preparation Systems Used in Academic Research and Development". In: *PLOS ONE* 9.12. Publisher: Public Library of Science, e115069. ISSN: 1932-6203. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0115069. URL: https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0115069 (visited on 01/02/2026).

Monteiro-Krebs, Luciana et al. (Dec. 21, 2021). "Trespassing the gates of research: identifying algorithmic mechanisms that can cause distortions and biases in academic social media". In: *Online Information Review* 46.5, pp. 993–1013. ISSN: 1468-4527. DOI: 10.1108/OIR-01-2021-0042. URL: https://doi.org/10.1108/OIR-01-2021-0042 (visited on 01/02/2026).

Page, Matthew J. et al. (Mar. 29, 2021). "PRISMA 2020 explanation and elaboration: updated guidance and exemplars for reporting systematic reviews". In: *BMJ* 372. Publisher: British Medical Journal Publishing Group Section: Research Methods & Reporting, n160. ISSN: 1756-1833. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.n160. URL: https://www.bmj.com/content/372/bmj.n160 (visited on 01/02/2026).

Palmatier, Robert W., Mark B. Houston, and John Hulland (Jan. 1, 2018). "Review articles: purpose, process, and structure". In: *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 46.1, pp. 1–5. ISSN: 1552-7824. DOI: 10.1007/s11747-017-0563-4. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-017-0563-4 (visited on 12/30/2025).

Peng, Roger D. (2011). "Reproducible Research in Computational Science". In: *Science* 334.6060. Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science, pp. 1226–1227. ISSN:

0036-8075. DOI: 10.1126/science.1213847. URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/41352177 (visited on 01/02/2026).

Portman, Jordana, Victoria Yael Miara Ms, and Ayelet Baram-Tsabari (Oct. 13, 2025). "How does social-media-based science communication affect young audiences? A scoping review of impact making". In: *Journal of Science Communication* 24.5. Publisher: SISSA Medialab srl, p. V02. ISSN: 1824-2049. DOI: 10.22323/145420250918092124. URL: https://jcom.sissa.it/article/pubid/JCOM_2405_2025_V02/ (visited on 01/02/2026).

Ram, Karthik (Feb. 28, 2013). "Git can facilitate greater reproducibility and increased transparency in science". In: *Source Code for Biology and Medicine* 8.1, p. 7. ISSN: 1751-0473. DOI: 10.1186/1751-0473-8-7. URL: https://doi.org/10.1186/1751-0473-8-7 (visited on 01/02/2026).

Roland, Damian (Jan. 1, 2018). "Social Media, Health Policy, and Knowledge Translation". In: *Journal of the American College of Radiology*. Social Media and Medicine 15.1, pp. 149–152. ISSN: 1546-1440. DOI: 10.1016/j.jacr.2017.09.009. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1546144017311249 (visited on 01/02/2026).

Sandve, Geir Kjetil et al. (Oct. 24, 2013). "Ten Simple Rules for Reproducible Computational Research". In: *PLOS Computational Biology* 9.10. Publisher: Public Library of Science, e1003285. ISSN: 1553-7358. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003285. URL: https://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003285 (visited on 01/02/2026).

Stone, Alyson and W. Randolph Ford (Jan. 1, 2017). "Chasing after a Century of Punctuation". In: *Procedia Computer Science*. Data Analytics Summit II; Structuring the UNSTRUCTURED: The Missing Element of Analytics, 14-16 December 2015, Harrisburg, USA 118, pp. 15–21. ISSN: 1877-0509. DOI: 10.1016/j.procs.2017.11.144. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877050917323475 (visited on 01/02/2026).

Wagner, Heinz-Theo and Bernhard Moos (2015). "Knowledge Management". In: *Wiley Encyclopedia of Management*. _eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/9781118785317.weom060 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, pp. 1–3. ISBN: 978-1-118-78531-7. DOI: 10.1002/978111878531

7.weom060128. URL: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781118785317.weom060128 (visited on 01/02/2026).

Watson, Mandy (Apr. 9, 2020). "How to undertake a literature search: a step-by-step guide". In: *British Journal of Nursing* 29.7. Publisher: Mark Allen Group, pp. 431–435. ISSN: 0966-0461. DOI: 10.12968/bjon.2020.29.7.431. URL: https://www.magonlinelibrary.com/doi/abs/10.12968/bjon.2020.29.7.431 (visited on 12/30/2025).

Weible, Christopher M., ed. (2023). *Theories of the policy process*. Fifth edition. New York London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group. 1 p. ISBN: 978-1-032-31124-1 978-1-003-30820-1.

Wilson, Greg et al. (June 22, 2017). "Good enough practices in scientific computing". In: *PLOS Computational Biology* 13.6. Publisher: Public Library of Science, e1005510. ISSN: 1553-7358. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005510. URL: https://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005510 (visited on 01/02/2026).

Wu, Lingfei, Dashun Wang, and James A. Evans (Feb. 2019). "Large teams develop and small teams disrupt science and technology". In: *Nature* 566.7744. Publisher: Nature Publishing Group, pp. 378–382. ISSN: 1476-4687. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-019-0941-9. URL: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-019-0941-9 (visited on 11/28/2025).

Zickar, Michael J. (2020). "Using Social Media to Promote Academic Functioning". In: *Encyclopedia of Education and Information Technologies*. Springer, Cham, pp. 1750–1752. ISBN: 978-3-030-10576-1. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-10576-1_213. URL: https://link.springer.com/rwe/10.1007/978-3-030-10576-1_213 (visited on 01/02/2026).